*Tells the Facts and Names the Names*

$2.50

# CounterPunch

January 16 - 31 2001 | *Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair* | VOL. 8, NO. 2

## In This Issue

**FAKING IT**

- Democrats Roll Over on Ashcroft
- They Could Have Made a Filibuster Stick
- They Say Yes to Blatant Racist Ashcroft But No to Nader

**LOVE-IN**

- They All Love Anne Veneman

**FROM QIBYA TO BEIRUT:**

- Ariel Sharon's Bloody Record

**WHY HIM?**

- Medal of Honor Goes to Racist Self Promoter

**STOLEN ELECTION**

- Gore Gets More Votes, Doesn't Care

### *Return of the Terrorist*

# The Crimes of Sharon

Some incorrigible optimists have suggested that only a right-wing extremist of the notoriety of Likud leader Ariel Sharon will have the credentials to broker any sort of lasting settlement with the Palestinians. Maybe so. History is not devoid of such examples. But Sharon?

Sharon's history offers a monochromatic record of moral corruption, with a documented record of war crimes going back to the early 1950s. He was born in 1928 and as a young man joined the Haganah, the underground military organization of Israel in its pre-state days. In 1953 he was given command of Unit 101, whose mission is often described as that of retaliation against Arab attacks on Jewish villages. In fact, as can be seen from two terrible onslaughts, one of them very well known, Unit 101's purpose was that of instilling terror by the infliction of discriminate, murderous violence not only on able bodied fighters but on the young, the old, the helpless.

Sharon's first documented sortie in this role was in August of 1953 on the refugee camp of El-Bureig, south of Gaza. An Israeli history of the 101 unit records 50 refugees as having been killed; other sources allege 15 or 20. Major-General Vagn Bennike, the UN commander, reported that "bombs were thrown" by Sharon's men "through the windows of huts in which the refugees were sleeping and, as they fled, they were attacked by small arms and automatic weapons".

In October of 1953 came the attack by Sharon's unit 101 on the Jordanian village of Qibya, whose "stain" Israel's foreign minister at the time, Moshe Sharett, confided to his diary "would stick to us and not be washed away for many years". He was wrong. Though even strongly pro-Israel commentators in the West compared it to Lidice, Qibya and Sharon's role are scarcely evoked in the West today, least of all by journalists such as Deborah Sontag of the New York Times who recently wrote a whitewash of Sharon, describing him as "feisty", or the Washington Post's man in Jerusalem who fondly invoked him after his fateful excursion to the Holy Places in Jerusalem as "the portly old warrior".

Israeli historian Avi Shlaim describes the massacre thus: "Sharon's order was to penetrate Qibya, blow up houses and inflict heavy casualties on its inhabitants. His success in carrying out the order surpassed all expectations. The full and macabre story of what happened at Qibya was revealed only during the morning after the attack. The village had been reduced to rubble: forty-five houses had been blown up, and sixty-nine civilians, two thirds of them women and children, had been killed. Sharon and his men claimed that they believed that all the inhabitants had run away and that they had no idea that anyone was hiding inside the houses."

The UN observer on the scene reached a different conclusion: "One story was repeated time after time: the bullet splintered door, the body sprawled across the threshhold, indicating that the inhabitants had been forced by heavy fire to stay inside until their homes were blown up over them." The slaughter in Qibya was described contemporaneously in a letter to the president of the United Nations Security Council dated 16 October 1953 (S/3113) from the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Jordan to the United States. On 14 October 1953 at 9:30 at night, he wrote, Israeli troops launched a battalion-scale attack on the village of Qibya in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (at the time the West Bank was annexed to Jordan).

According to the diplomat's account, Israeli forces had entered the village and systematically murdered all occupants of (**Sharon** continued on page 5)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Our Little Secrets

## Nader and the Dems

The Democrats on the Hill have kept one pledge: to lock Nader and his cohorts out of their offices. They even refused to allow him to testify against John Ashcroft. "We're not going to touch him with a 10-foot pole," vowed Rep. Robert Wexler, the Democrat from Florida. "He has divorced himself from the very ideals that made him a worthwhile political actor. He sold out his constituency."

But at the very moment they've barred the door to Public Citizen, Democrats in droves rushed to confirm the very forces of evil they blame Nader for putting into power. Tommy Thompson, hammer of the poor; Donald Rumsfeld, maestro of Star Wars; Christie Todd Whitman, postergirl for racial profiling; Paul O'Neill, corporate titan; Mel Martinez, anti-Castro zealot; Ann Veneman, biotech booster. All have seen the senate confirm them unanimously.

Then there is Gale Norton, like John Ashcroft an admirer of the Confederacy. The Sierra Club spent more than $1.5 millions fighting her nomination in a campaign that denounced her as the heiress of James Watt's slash-and-burn philosophy. It didn't yield many results. Only two Democrats voted against Norton in the Interior committee's hearings (Oregon's Ron Wyden and New York's Chuck Schumer). The floor vote by the entire senate was even more of an embarrassment, as a retinue of Democrats lavished praise on her in their speeches, including Max Baucus, Jeff Bingaman, John Breaux, Robert Byrd, Maria Cantwell, Jean Carnahan, Tom Carper, Kent Conrad, Tom Daschle, Christopher Dodd, Russ Feingold, Dianne Feinstein, Fritz Hollings, Daniel Inouye, Tim Johnson, Herbert Kohl, Mary Landrieu, Blanche Lincoln, Zell Miller, Patty Murray, Ben Nelson, Bill Nelson and Harry Reid. Many of these senators had been endorsed for election by the Sierra Club and the League of Conservation Voters.

The Ashcroft hearings were a testimony to how far we've come on racial politics in this country. Nowhere. Not one Democratic senator had the guts to say publicly what is clear from the evidence: Ashcroft is a racist and racists shouldn't serve as attorney general. The Democrats, even Kennedy, did the reverse. They made a point to preface their remarks by saying that they knew Ashcroft wasn't a racist. Of course, there is not one black senator on the judiciary committee or the entire US senate.

We have entered the era of symbol resistance, pretend politics and the final Ashcroft vote proves it. Ashcroft was confirmed by the Senate with a 58-42 vote. Eight Democrats defected to Ashcroft: Breaux, Byrd, Conrad, Dodd, Dorgan, Feingold, Miller and Nelson of Nebraska. That's bad enough. But what's worse is that the Democratic leadership knew it had enough votes to sustain a filibuster against Ashcroft but instructed Kennedy to drop the tactic for the sake of harmony in government. And Kennedy, proving that he is just bluster, agreed. Perhaps the charges against the man who annoints himself with Crisco oil were inflated, trumped up. But a look at his record makes that notion seem farfetched. It's more likely that the public interest sector and their allies in the senate see in Ashcroft too rich a vein of fundraising material to let him be discarded. Better to sully him as anti-black, anti-gay, anti-women religious zealot and then raise money off of him every three weeks for the next four years.

But if the liberals can't (or won't) stop Ashcroft and Norton, what will they fight for? These votes demonstrate two things: the lack of will on the part of senate Democrats and the impotence of the Beltway public interest groups. Back in Reagantime, Friends of the Earth delivered to the steps of the capital more than a million signatures on a petition against James Watt. This winter the combined might of the NAACP, NOW, the Sierra Club and People for the American Way could only generate a feeble 150,000 signatures against Ashcroft. As usual, the most effective presentations against the Bush cabinet picks came out of Nader's shops. It's a shame none of the Democrats took the chance to listen to what he had to say.

## Lest We Forget: The Stolen Election

Though he doesn't seem to care, Al Gore keeps picking up votes in Florida, even in predominately Republican counties. A review by the Chicago Tribune shows that more than 1,700 votes in 15 rural Florida counties were discarded even though they showed a clear choice for president. If the votes had been counted, Gore would have picked up a net gain of 366 votes. Again most of these votes came from black precincts.

Meanwhile, a team of reporters at the Palm Beach Post examined the notorious 2,500 dimpled ballots in Palm Beach County. Gore wanted them counted, but the Democrat-controlled elections board for the county refused. The Post reported that if those ballots had been counted, Gore would have picked up another 682 votes. Those would have been added to the 174 additional votes for Gore found in the recount which were not certified by secretary of state Katherine Harris, who deemed Bush the winner of Florida by 537 votes.

If these legal votes for Gore had been counted, Gore would have won Florida by 685 votes. But Gore has only himself and his advisers to blame. If he had asked for a hand recount of the entire state, it would likely have been granted and would have undercut the Bush team's best pr argument about the fairness of the process. But the Gore camp failed to grasp—or refused to highlight for political reasons— the racial dimension to the vote gap, which demonstrated that both the undervote (dimples) and the overvote (two marks) would have gone in Gore's favor.

## Democracy When?

9:05am, January 31, 2001

AMY GOODMAN: "And you're listening to Pacifica Radio's Democracy Now. I'm Amy Goodman, here with Juan Gonzalez."

Editors
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

Business Manager
Becky Grant

Design
Deborah Thomas

Counselor
Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions/supporters
$30 student/low-income
**CounterPunch**.
All rights reserved.
**CounterPunch**
**3220 N. St., NW, PMB 346**
**Washington, DC, 20007-2829**
**1-800-840-3683 (phone)**
**1-800-967-3620 (fax)**
**www.counterpunch.org**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

***William Carlos Williams greeted the Beats politely, then looked gloomily out of the window at Rutherford, muttering "There sure are a lot of bastards out there."***

JUAN GONZALEZ: "Amy, do you realize the anniversary that we're approaching, in the next few days? It will be five years since Democracy Now came on the air, since you and I started working in February of 1996 to produce the first of these shows.

"Quite simply, I've come to the conclusion that the Pacifica Board has been hijacked by a small clique that has more in common with modern-day corporate vultures than with working-class America. That clique has illegally changed the foundation's bylaws and, during the past two years it has methodically sought to squash dissent throughout the network, first at KPFA, then at PNN News, then at Democracy Now, and now at WBAI.

"This group does not respect free speech. It does not respect labor or civil rights. It doesn't even practice due process for its own managers. And it's now seeking to radically alter Pacifica's bylaws to pave the way for the selling of one or more stations. Finally, Amy, I've got to tell you that the consistent attacks on you, the most important public face at Pacifica, have so poisoned the atmosphere at the network that it's becoming increasingly difficult for many people of conscience to continue working here. …

"This clique on the board insults Pacifica's loyal and sophisticated listeners by asking them to finance its shenanigans with their donations.

"Therefore, starting today, I will be joining other Pacifica listeners in a national corporate campaign that will not rest until every board member who has orchestrated this hijacking resigns and a new board is in place, a board that is democratically accountable to the network's listeners, to the communities of the stations of Pacifica, and to its staff. Our campaign is calling for listeners across the country to withhold donations to Pacifica in a mass referendum against the board's policies.

"Instead, we will be urging the listeners to contribute their money to a variety of groups across the country that are battling the Pacifica board, including the legal fund for court suits which are currently challenging the board's legitimacy.

"Mr. Murdock, Mr. Acosta, Mr. Palmer, and the other clique on the board will soon find out that Pacifica is listener-sponsored community radio and I am sorry to have to take this kind of action, but, and I fully support you in continuing to keep Democracy Now alive as long as possible under these trying circumstances, Amy, but I am sure and I am hopeful that a few months from now, once this clique has been removed, that I may be able to resume Democracy Now.

"The phone number and the email address for listeners who want to support this campaign against the Pacifica Board: (212) 871-9322, and the email address is pacificacampaign@yahoo.com. Please communicate with me and others today, or tomorrow and in the coming days, and you can join the campaign to oust this board."

## THE TRUTH ABOUT TEDDY

Among Bill Clinton's final acts were the pardoning of noted crook Marc Rich, the failure to pardon Leonard Peltier and approval of a congressional bill to give that blustering racist Teddy Roosevelt a posthumous medal of honor. CounterPuncher Monica Finch, who works at the University of Michigan, has been following the campaign to honor TR for the last couple of years. Here's a letter she sent out last December:

"Since 1998, I've followed the movement to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to Theodore Roosevelt. He coveted this high honor all his life and actively campaigned for it, much to the chagrin of his many supporters. At one time he wrote, 'I am entitled to the Medal of Honor, and I want it.' Roosevelt felt it was his due because of his service during the Spanish American War, specifically his 'charge' up San Juan Hill.

"First, the Medal of Honor is a distinction that no one can pursue. The recipients have performed unselfish, unscripted and unselfconscious acts of bravery in combat. It isn't the same as becoming an Eagle Scout - a distinction that can be attained by drive and determination. Secondly, while reading Big Trouble by J. Anthony Lukas, the late historian, I came upon this – 'In the June 24 skirmish at Las Guasimas, [in Cuba] 16 Rough Riders were killed and more might have lost their lives had the 10th Cavalry [a black unit] not ridden to their support.' Likewise, the inflated accounts of Richard Harding Davis, a reporter for the New York Herald and Scribner's, made Roosevelt and the Rough Riders the heroes of San Juan Hill in his colorful action-packed stories that read like Westerns. In fact, Roosevelt himself cultivated and fed many of these self-aggrandizing accounts to Davis. [He even rushed out a quickie book on the Rough Riders, to his own greater glory.]

"In reality, the infantry, largely the black 24th regiment who first rode out into harm's way, already had secured the hill. They were in the first wave and suffered the most casualties. In the diary of their white commanding officer's wife she wrote, 'The Colored 24th is the real hero of San Juan Hill, not T. Roosevelt and the Rough Riders.' The black troops' bravery in battle was so conspicuous that it was acknowledged on the floor of Congress by John F. Fitzgerald (JFK's grandfather). He cited the 10th Cavalry for [rushing] to the assistance of the Rough Riders." The 1st Voluntary Cavalry, (aka Rough Riders), was comprised, by and large, of Manhattan socialites and TR cronies who signed on as a lark. TR's uniform was custom tailored at Brooks Brothers.

"After the war on his way to the Presidency, Roosevelt continued to embellish his own legend while downplaying the black troops' heroics. Over the years, he even declared the black soldiers had retreated (an egregious untruth). If there were some modicum of justice, it would be right and long overdue to acknowledge the heroics of the black troops during the Spanish American War. The Congressional Medal of Honor is no trinket. It is too grand an award to go to a self-made legend - dead or living."

Monica tells us she sent this to various newspapers, to the Medal of Honor Society, the Buffalo Soldiers national hq, to the NAACP and other interested parties. Nary an answer did she get, except from another CounterPuncher, Bruce Anderson, editor of the ever-glorious Anderson Valley Advertiser. Bruce promptly published the letter. Incidentally, Monica hails from Rutherford, N.J. and her grandmother's physician was William Carlos Williams. T.S. Eliot came to town and so did the beatniks in the form of Ginsberg, Kerouac and Cassady. Williams greeted them politely, then looked gloomily out of the window at Rutherford, muttering "There sure are a lot of bastards out there."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## The Bush Cabinet

# They All Love Veneman

The California biotech laywer Anne Veneman was George Bush's sur prise pick to head the sprawling Agriculture Department, which oversees farm policy, food safety and, through a quirk of departmental gerrymandering, the Forest Service. Veneman is the first woman to hold the post. She's single, pro-choice and, as far as can be told, not particularly ideological. Veneman even worked for a spell in DC's top Democratic law firm, Patton Boggs.

Despite the fact that Democrats controlled the Senate Agriculture committee for the duration of the hearing, Veneman's confirmation was a breeze from the get-go, with senators simply using their mike-time to beg her to boost subsidies for their states' most overstocked crop, from durum wheat to field corn for ethanol to Round-Up-Ready soybeans.

But the glad-handing didn't stop there. Even the public interest sector, ever ready to exploit any blotches in a nominee's background to boost fundraising, remained silent. The environmentalists didn't target her, even though as the nominal head of the Forest Service she will be largely responsible for the fate of the ancient forests, wilderness areas and endangered species habitat. Health groups said little despite her opposition to stringent meat inspection standards and complaisance to the threat of mad cow disease, which has put Europe into a turmoil and has already been detected in the United States.

Consumer groups are split. Nader's forces have ripped Veneman's record, as unrelentingly pro-corporate. But she has been welcomed by the likes of Carol Tucker Foreman, one of those Washington divas who makes a living wearing two hats: by day a public affairs officer for the Consumer Federation of America's Food Policy Institute; by night a Monsanto lobbyist. "Anne Veneman will bring a modern view of the Department of Agriculture into the job," Foreman said.

And despite a depression in the farm belt, agriculture and farmer groups voiced only muted concerns. The normally militant National Farmers Union actually endorsed her.

So what's up here?

First, there's Veneman's resumé. She's a pro-choice, moderate Republican from California. And there aren't many members of the Bush Squad who started out their law careers as a public defender, never even migrating over to the prosecutor office. She also toiled for one of the country's most elaborate public transit systems, San Francisco's BART, long a target of the right.

Still, in an era of unbridled political nepotism, Veneman is no exception to the rule. She got her start in politics courtesy of her father, John Veneman, a California peach king and Republican powerbroker who served as undersecretary of health and human services under Nixon.

In 1986 Veneman landed a spot in the Department of Agriculture where she became a protégé of Richard Lyng, the California seed baron who served as Reagan's secretary of agriculture.

***Veneman bodes ill for the family farms of the rural South, Midwest and Great Plains.***

Veneman's press agents have claimed that she was the first woman to head the California Department of Agriculture, a position handed to her by Pete Wilson in 1995. Not true. The great (and sadly, late) Rose Bird was appointed by Jerry Brown to that position, initiating a range of progressive measures so infuriating to the corporate agribusiness regime in the state that they used it to help sabotage her reelection to the California Supreme Court.

There's a crisis in farm country and it has been deepening for decades. Last year direct federal payments to farm operations totalled $22 billion—that's more than half total farm income. With numbers like that, the few family farmers left are feeling even more anxiety now that a bunch of self-professed libertarians are in the executive branch.

But Veneman's no libertarian. She believes in subsidies. It's all a matter of how they are allocated. This is good news for the agri-giants of the Central Valley, where she will no doubt look fondly on their demands for more water, fewer environmental safeguards and pleas to hold off on banning ozone-destroying fumigants such as methyl bromide.

The new ag secretary bodes ill for the family farms of the rural South, Midwest and Great Plains, already on the verge of becoming post-modern sharecroppers for the big two grain companies that control the market. A similar fate afflicts the beef, pork and chicken industry. A decade of unbridled consolidation, capped off by Tyson Foods' recent acquisition of the world's largest beef company, IBP, has driven independent farmers under at record rates.

The ones who suffer most are the poorest and the least politically connected. In America that means black farmers, who are going bankrupt at 3 to 4 times the rate of white farmers in similar economic conditions. In 1920 black farmers accounted for 14 per cent of family-owned farms in the US. Today the number is less than one per cent. Throughout her confirmation hearings Veneman wasn't asked one question about how she will deal with the problems faced by black farmers.

Veneman's an ardent free-trader. Bush picked her to negotiate the agriculture provisions for the initial NAFTA agreement and US negotiator on GATT, the organization that later became the World Trade Organization. Both trade pacts have ravaged American farmers, particularly in the wheat belt of the Great Plains, while vastly benefitting transnational agri-giants such as Archer Daniels Midland. But as far as Veneman's concerned there's no looking back. She's said she's anxious to get China into the WTO and to expand NAFTA to include Chile.

She's also an unapologetic booster of biotech. Veneman sat on the board of Calgene (now a subsidiary of Monsanto) which developed the first test-tube tomato and a genetically-engineered form of rice. As a lawyer/lobbyist at Patton Boggs, the big Democratic firm in DC, she represented biotech firms. "We simply will not be able to feed the world without biotechnology," Veneman told an agricultural biotechnology conference in 2000.

Okay. That doesn't look so good. But the most striking thing about Veneman is how similar she is to her Clintonoid predecessor, Dan Glickman and his associates, who pushed Monsanto's frankencrop agenda at home and abroad, refused to interfere with the consolidation of big agriculture and hawked trade deals left and right.

In fact, the transition at USDA will barely be noticed. You think that's an overstatement? Here's how Clinton's former chief of staff, Leon Panetta, described the Veneman pick:"They couldn't have made a better selection, in my book." CP

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(**Sharon** *continued from page 1)*

houses, using automatic weapons, grenades and incendiaries. On 14 October, the bodies of 42 Arab civilians had been recovered; several more bodies were still under the wreckage. Forty houses, the village school and a reservoir had been destroyed. Quantities of unused explosives, bearing Israel army markings in Hebrew, had been found in the village. At about 3 a.m., to cover their withdrawal, Israeli support troops had begun shelling the neighbouring villages of Budrus and Shuqba from positions in Israel.

And what of Sharon's conduct when he was head of the Southern Command of Israel's Defense Forces in the early 1970s? The Gaza "clearances" were vividly described by Phil Reeves in a piece in The London Independent on January 21 of this year.

"Thirty years have elapsed since Ariel Sharon, favourite to win Israel's forthcoming election, was the head of the Israel Defence Forces' southern command, charged with the task of 'pacifying' the recalcitrant Gaza Strip after the 1967 war. But the old men still remember it well. Especially the old men on Wreckage Street. Until late 1970, Wreckage, or Had'd, Street wasn't a street, just one of scores of narrow, nameless alleys weaving through Gaza City's Beach Camp, a shantytown cluttered with low, two-roomed houses, built with UN aid for refugees from the 1948 war who then, as now, were waiting for the international community to settle their future. The street acquired its name after an unusually prolonged visit from Mr Sharon's soldiers. Their orders were to bulldoze hundreds of homes to carve a wide, straight street. This would allow Israeli troops and their heavy armored vehicles to move easily through the camp, to exert control and hunt down men from the Palestinian Liberation Army.

"'They came at night and began marking the houses they wanted to demolish with red paint,' said Ibrahim Ghanim, 70, a retired labourer. 'In the morning they came back, and ordered everyone to leave. I remember all the soldiers shouting at people, Yalla, yalla, yalla, yalla! They threw everyone's belongings into the street. Then Sharon brought in bulldozers and started flattening the street. He did the whole lot, almost in one day. And the soldiers would beat people, can you imagine? Soldiers with guns, beating little kids!' By the time the Israeli army's work was done, hundreds of homes were destroyed, not only on Wreckage Street but throughout the camp, as Sharon ploughed out a grid of wide security roads. Many of the refugees took shelter in schools, or squeezed into the already badly overcrowded homes of relatives. Other families, usually those with a Palestinian political activist, were loaded into trucks and taken to exile in a town in the heart of the Sinai Desert, then controlled by Israel."

***The purpose of Sharon's Unit 101 was that of instilling terror by the infliction of discriminate, murderous violence.***

As Reeves reported, the devastation of Beach Camp was far from the exception. "In August 1971 alone, troops under Mr Sharon's command destroyed some 2,000 homes in the Gaza Strip, uprooting 16,000 people for the second time in their lives. Hundreds of young Palestinian men were arrested and deported to Jordan and Lebanon. Six hundred relatives of suspected guerrillas were exiled to Sinai. In the second half of 1971, 104 guerrillas were assassinated. 'The policy at that time was not to arrest suspects, but to assassinate them', said Raji Sourani, director of the Palestinian Centre for Human Rights in Gaza City".

Israeli complacency leading to their initial defeat by the Egyptians in the 1973 war was in part nurtured by the supposed impregnability of the "Bar Lev line" constructed by Sharon on the east bank of the Suez canal. The Egyptians pierced the line without undue difficulty.

In 1981 Sharon, then minister of defense, paid a visit to Israel's good friend, President Mobutu of Zaire. Lunching on Mobutu's yacht the Israeli party was asked by their host to use their good offices to get the US Congress to be more forthcoming with aid. This the Israelis managed to accomplish. As a quid pro quo Mobutu reestablished diplomatic relations with Israel. This was not Sharon's only contact with Africa. Among friends he relays fond memories of trips to Angola to observe and advise the South African forces then fighting in support of the murderous CIA stooge Jonas Savimbi.

As defense minister in Menachem Begin's second government, Sharon was the commander who led the full dress 1982 assault on Lebanon, with the express design of destroying the PLO, driving as many Palestinians as possible to Jordan and making Lebanon a client state of Israel. It was a war plan that cost untold suffering, around 20,000 Palestinian and Lebanese lives, and also the deaths of over one thousand Israeli soldiers. The Israelis bombed civilian populations at will. Sharon also oversaw the infamous massacres at Sabra and Shatilla refugee camps. The Lebanese government counted 762 bodies recovered and a further 1,200 buried privately by relatives. However, the Middle East may have been spared worse, thanks to Menachem Begin. Just as the '82 war was getting under way, Sharon approached Begin, then Prime Minister, and suggested that Begin cede control over Israel's nuclear trigger to him. Begin had just enough sense to refuse.

The slaughter in the two contiguous camps at Sabra and Shatilla took place from 6:00 at night on September 16, 1982 until 8:00 in the morning on September 18, 1982, in an area under the control of the Israel Defense Forces. The perpetrators were members of the Phalange militia, the Lebanese force that was armed by and closely allied with Israel since the onset of Lebanon's civil war in 1975. The victims during the 62-hour rampage included infants, children, women (including pregnant women), and the elderly, some of whom were mutilated or disemboweled before or after they were killed.

An official Israeli commission of inquiry — chaired by Yitzhak Kahan, president of


## SUBSCRIPTION INFO

**Enter/Renew Subscription here:**

One year individual, $40
($35 email only / $45 email/print)
One year institution/supporters $100
One year student/low income, $30
T-shirts, $17
Please send back issue(s)
_____ ($5/issue)

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

_____

Payment must accompany order, or just dial 1-800-840-3683 and renew by credit card. Add $17.50 for foreign subscriptions. If you want CounterPunch emailed to you please supply your email address. Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch.**
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558


LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Israel's Supreme Court — investigated the massacre, and in February 1983 publicly released its findings (without Appendix B, which remains secret until now).

Amid desperate attempts to cover up the evidence of direct knowledge of what was going on by Israeli military personnel, the Kahan Commission found itself compelled to find that Ariel Sharon, among other Israelis, had responsibility for the massacre. The commission's report stated: "It is our view that responsibility is to be imputed to the Minister of Defense for having disregarded ["entirely cognizant of" would have been a better choice of words] the danger of acts of vengeance and bloodshed by the Phalangists against the population of the refugee camps, and having failed [i.e."eagerly taken this into consideration"] to take this danger into account when he decided to have the Phalangists enter the camps. In addition, responsibility is to be imputed to the Minister of Defense for not ordering appropriate measures for preventing or reducing the danger of massacre as a condition for the Phalangists' entry into the camps. These blunders constitute the non-fulfillment of a duty with which the Defense Minister was charged". (For those who want to refresh their memories of Operation Peace for Galilee, of the massacres and the Kahan coverup we recommend Noam Chomsky's The Fateful Triangle.)

Sharon refused to resign. Finally, on February 14, 1983, he was relieved of his duties as defense minister, though he remained in the cabinet as minister without portfolio.

Sharon's career was in eclipse, but he continued to burnish his credentials as a Likud ultra. Sharon has always been against any sort of peace deal, unless on terms entirely impossible for Palestinians to accept. As Nehemia Strasler outlined in Ha'aretz on January 18 of this year, in 1979, as a member of Begin's cabinet, he voted against a peace treaty with Egypt. In 1985 he voted against the withdrawal of Israeli troops to the so-called security zone in Southern Lebanon. In 1991 he opposed Israel's participation in the Madrid peace conference. In 1993 he voted No in the Knesset on the Oslo agreement. The following year he abstained in the Knesset on a vote over a peace treaty with Jordan. He voted against the Hebron agreement in 1997 and objected to the way in which the withdrawal from southern Lebanon was conducted.

As Begin's minister of agriculture in the late 1970s he established many of the West Bank settlements that are now a major obstruction to any peace deal. His present position? Not another square inch of land for Palestinians on the West Bank. He will agree to a Palestinian state on the existing areas presently under either total or partial Palestinian control, amounting to merely 42 per cent of the West Bank. Israel will retain control of the highways across the West Bank and the water sources. All settlements will stay in place with access by the IDF to them. Jerusalem will remain under Israeli sovereignty and he plans to continue building around the city. The Golan heights would remain under Israel's control.

It can be strongly argued that Sharon represents the long-term policy of all Israeli governments, without any obscuring fluff or verbal embroidery. For example: Ben-Gurion approved the terror missions of Unit 101. Every Israeli government has condoned settlements and building around Jerusalem. It was Labor's Ehud Barak who okayed the military escort for Sharon on his provocative sortie that sparked the second Intifada and Barak who has overseen the lethal military repression of recent months. But that doesn't diminish Sharon's sinister shadow across the past half century. That shadow is better evoked by Palestinians and Lebanese grieving for the dead, the maimed, the displaced, or by a young Israeli woman, Ilil Komey, 16, who confronted Sharon recently when he visited her agricultural high school outside Beersheva. "I think you sent my father into Lebanon", Ilil said. "Ariel Sharon, I accuse you of having made me suffer for 16 some odd years. I accuse you of having made my father suffer for over 16 years. I accuse you of a lot of things that made a lot of people suffer in this country. I don't think that you can now be elected as prime minister". CP

***"The Kahan Commission found itself compelled to find that Ariel Sharon, among other Israelis, had responsibility for the massacre."***

**CounterPunch**
**3220 N Street, NW, PMB 346**
**Washington, DC 20007-2829**

Attention Subscribers: the number that appears above your name on the mailing label refers to the ISSUE NUMBER of CounterPunch after which your subscription expires, NOT the month. Don't worry, this confuses everyone.

## *Why the Democrats Threw in the Towel on Ashcroft*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED